EXHIBIT "A"

(SCE&G's name change to Dominion, occurred after these three disputes began)

1.	Alleged a broad pattern of discrimination by	
	Ecoplexus – YES	Beulah/Eastover – NO
2.	Alleged specific violations of PURPA by SC	
	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
3.	Filed a formal complaint with this Commiss	
	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
4.	Alleged that date of LEO in dispute?	
	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
5.	Alleged a violation of a FERC decision?	
_	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
6.	Alleged a dispute over "case study models"	
_	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
7.	Alleged improper interconnection costs by S	
	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
8.	Alleged that SCE&G failed to evaluate "light	
	Ecoplexus – YES	Beulah/Eastover – NO
9.	Alleged that SCE&G failed to negotiate in g	
	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
10.	Seeks the availability of a retroactive PR-2 i	
	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
11.	Pled the importance of queue position?	
	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
12.	Pled that SCE&G negotiated in bad faith?	
	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
13.	Pled the importance of prior SCE&G witnes	•
	Ecoplexus – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
14.	Alleged a violation of FERC Order 69?	D 11/5
	Ecoplexus – YES	Beulah/Eastover – NO
15.	Alleged SCE&G offers commercial terms the	
	Ecoplexus – YES	Beulah/Eastover – NO
16.	Complained of inconsistent CODs in SCE&	
	<u>Ecoplexus</u> – YES	<u>Beulah/Eastover</u> – NO
17.	Alleged a violation of Provision 12.12 in SC	CE&G's Interconnection Agreement?
_,,	Ecoplexus – NO	Beulah/Eastover – YES
18.	Pled S.C. Code Ann., Section 58-27-980?	120
10.	Ecoplexus – NO	Beulah/Eastover – YES
19.	Alleged improper curtailment language in S	
	Ecoplexus – NO	Beulah/Eastover – YES
20.	Pled the importance of the stakeholder proce	<u> </u>
_~.	Ecoplexus – NO	Beulah/Eastover – YES
21.	Pled jurisdiction by way of a Request for M	
•	Ecoplexus – NO	Beulah/Eastover – YES